

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-0854V

(not to be published)

BERNADETTE MOYA,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: December 20, 2022

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Attorney's Fees and Costs

*Leigh Finfer, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for Petitioner.*

*Matthew Murphy, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

### **DECISION ON ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS<sup>1</sup>**

On July 14, 2020, Bernadette Moya filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner received an influenza ("flu") vaccine, which vaccine is contained in the Vaccine Injury Table (the "Table"), 42 C.F.R. § 100.3(a), in her left arm on October 12, 2018. Petitioner alleges that she sustained a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration ("SIRVA") within the time period set forth in the Table following administration of the flu vaccine, or in the alternative, that her alleged shoulder injury was

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

caused-in-fact by the vaccine. She further alleges that she experienced the residual effects of this condition for more than six months. ECF No. 42. On September 6, 2022, a decision was issued awarding compensation to Petitioner based on the parties' stipulation. *Id.*

Petitioner has now filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs, dated October 28, 2022 (ECF No. 47), requesting a total award of \$14,539.22 (representing \$13,974.00 in fees and \$565.22 in costs). In accordance with General Order No. 9, counsel for Petitioner represents that Petitioner incurred no out-of-pocket expenses. *Id.* at 2. Respondent reacted to the motion on November 1, 2022, indicating that he does not oppose Petitioner's request for attorney's fees and costs, however his "lack of objection to the amount sought in this case should not be construed as admission, concession, or waiver as to the hourly rates requested, the number of hours billed, or the other litigation related costs." ECF No. 48. On November 8, 2022, counsel for Petitioner notified the AFC paralegal that Petitioner did not intend to file a reply. *See Informal remark*, November 9, 2022.

I have reviewed the billing records submitted with Petitioner's request. In my experience, the request appears reasonable, and I find no cause to reduce the requested hours or rates.

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Section 15(e). Accordingly, I hereby GRANT Petitioner's Motion for attorney's fees and costs. I award a total of **\$14,539.22** (representing \$13,974.00 in fees and \$565.22 in costs) as a lump sum in the form of a check jointly payable to Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel. In the absence of a timely-filed motion for review (see Appendix B to the Rules of the Court), the Clerk shall enter judgment in accordance with this decision.<sup>3</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**  
Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master

---

<sup>3</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing their right to seek review.